

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-9, 11-15, 17-19, and 21-27 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 1, 14, 19, and 26 have been amended, and claims 2, 10, 16, 20, and 28 are cancelled as shown on pages 2 to 7 of the Reply.

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

I. Rejection of Claims 1, 3-9, 11-15, 17-25, and 27 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1, 3-9, 11-15, 17-25, and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Loughran (US 7,185,211) in view of Roy, *et al.* (US 2005/0041652). It is requested that this rejection be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Loughran and Roy, *et al.*, when taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all aspects recited in the subject claims.

[T]he prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all claim limitations. *See* MPEP §706.02(j). *See In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991). *See In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974).

The claimed subject matter generally relates to facilitating selective power management in a wireless mobile terminal such that some portions of the terminal may remain powered and operable while removing power from components not being utilized. In one example, a plurality of power management schemes, stored in a configuration bank, can be employed while ensuring continuous and uninterrupted network connectivity by maintaining power to components necessary to facilitate such connectivity (e.g., network radio, CPU, etc). By keeping power to the network radio, the mobile device can receive network communications, though other portions of the device are in a low or no power state, including information regarding controlling power of the device. To this end, claim 1 recites in part *a power management component that utilizes at least one power management scheme to selectively control power to at least one portion of the wireless mobile terminal while maintaining power to a central processing unit (CPU) and a network radio of the wireless mobile terminal to ensure reliable*

uninterrupted network communication while removing power from other portions of the wireless mobile terminal to reduce power consumption, the power management component controls the power of the at least one portion of the wireless mobile terminal by wirelessly transmitting one or more control signals to the network radio of the wireless mobile terminal. Claim 19 recites similar aspects of communicating power information to the network radio of a mobile device though other portions might be in a low power or no power state as well. Loughran and Roy, *et al.*, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest such claimed aspects.

Loughran relates to a system for effectuating power management within software applications by electing certain features to be utilized and features not to be utilized. For example, many applications today can have animated items that are not essential to the functionality, but add an aesthetic interface to the application. Such animations can be disabled in some instances to conserve power in Loughran. However, Loughran fails to disclose or suggest *a power management component that utilizes at least one power management scheme to selectively control power to at least one portion of the wireless mobile terminal while maintaining power to a central processing unit (CPU) and a network radio of the wireless mobile terminal to ensure reliable uninterrupted network communication while removing power from other portions of the wireless mobile terminal to reduce power consumption, the power management component controls the power of the at least one portion of the wireless mobile terminal by wirelessly transmitting one or more control signals to the network radio of the wireless mobile terminal* as recited in subject claim 1, and similar aspects in claim 19.

Though Loughran appears to teach selectively removing software features to attain power savings, Loughran fails to explicitly or inherently contemplate maintaining power to a CPU and network radio in the sections cited by the Examiner. Moreover, Loughran does not teach or suggest wirelessly controlling power of a wireless mobile terminal by transmitting one or more control signals received by the network radio (though other portions may be powered down) as recited in claims 1 and 19. The Examiner also offers Roy, *et al.* to cure other deficiencies of the former claims, but Roy, *et al.* does not cure Loughran with respect to the amended claims.

Furthermore, claim 14 as amended similarly recites *wirelessly receiving indicia from the remotely located power manager to the network radio indicating that power should be supplied to a second portion of the portable terminal*. As shown above, Loughran and Roy, *et al.* do not teach or suggest power information being transmitted wirelessly as recited in claim 14.

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is readily apparent that Loughran and Roy, *et al.*, when taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest each and every element recited in claims 1, 14, and 19. Therefore, rejection of claims 1, 14, and 19, as well as claims 3-9, 11-13, 15, 17-18, 21-25, and 27, which depend therefrom, should be withdrawn.

II. Rejection of Claim 26 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 26 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Loughran, in view of Roy, *et al.* and Schneider, *et al.* (US 2005/0015618). It is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Loughran, Roy, *et al.*, and Schneider, *et al.*, when taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all elements recited in the subject claim. In particular, claim 26 recites similar aspects as claim 1, and Loughran and Roy, *et al.* have been shown deficient in regard to claim 1. Schneider, *et al.* fails to make up for the deficiencies of Loughran and Roy, *et al.* Therefore, this rejection should be withdrawn.

III. Rejection of Claim 14 Under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claim 14 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being allegedly indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention. This claim has been amended and currently complies with this section. Thus, this rejection should be withdrawn.

IV. Objection of Claim 12

The Examiner objects to claim 12 contending it would be clarifying if “wherein” was added to line 1 of claim 12 so that it reads: The system of claim 1, wherein the power management scheme is an intelligence created configuration. Applicants’ representative

maintains that the claim is clear as currently drafted and does not believe the above modification is required.

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [SYMBP193US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP

/Himanshu S. Amin/

Himanshu S. Amin

Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP
24TH Floor, National City Center
1900 E. 9TH Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731